

REMARKS

Claims 1-22 are pending and stand rejected. Please cancel claim 8 without prejudice to refiling.

The Office Action objected to claim 8 under 37 CFR 1.75(c). Applicant has cancelled claim 8. Therefore, this objection is moot.

The Office Action rejected claims 1-5, 8-13, and 16-20 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by an article entitled “Composable Ada Software Components and the Re-Export Paradigm” by Bardin and Thompson (hereinafter “Bardin”). Claim 8 has been cancelled and its rejection is moot.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with regard to claims 1-5, 9-13, and 16-20. Bardin describes a re-export operation for the Ada programming language. The Ada programming language is not a database system. Bardin does not describe creating a UDT in a database system, as required in claims 1, 9, and 16. Accordingly, Bardin does not anticipate claims 1, 9, and 16. Claims 2-4, 10-13, and 17-20 all depend from one of claims 1, 9, and 16 and are patentable for at least the same reasons. Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejected claims 6, 7, 14, 15, 21, and 22 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bardin in view of United States Patent Publication 2006/0064412 (hereinafter “Cunningham”).

Applicant respectfully disagrees. With respect to claims 6, 14, and 21, neither of the cited references teaches or suggests recording, in a data dictionary, the activated underlying operations for the UD, as required by claims 6, 14, and 21. The Office Action acknowledges that Bardin does not include this element. Cunningham describes mapping storage platform schemas to UDT classes in a database engine store, Cunningham at [0064], but does not hint that (a) the database engine store is a data dictionary or (b) the mapping includes a description of selected operations for a data type. Consequently, claims 6, 14, and 21 are not obvious in light of the Office Action’s combination of Bardin and Cunningham. Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

With respect to claims 7, 15, and 22, neither of the cited references teaches or suggests accepting a query including a query operator that takes one or more operands, where one or more of the operands are UDT columns, determining whether the query operator is activated for the UDT of each UDT column, and if it is, performing the operation, as required by claims 7, 15 and 22. The Office Action acknowledges that Bardin does not include this element. Cunningham does not have a need for such a feature because Cunningham does not provide for selectively activating one or more operations from an underlying UDT. If all of the query operators available from an underlying UDT are activated for a UDT, as Cunningham describes, there is no need to determine whether the query operator is activated for the UDT. Consequently, claims 7, 15, and 22 are not obvious in light of the Office Action's combination of Bardin and Cunningham. Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

SUMMARY

Applicant contends that the claims are in condition for allowance, which action is requested. Applicant does not believe any fees are necessary with the submitting of this response. Should any fees be required, Applicant requests that the fees be debited from deposit account number 50-4370.

Respectfully submitted,

/Howard L. Speight/

Howard L. Speight

Reg. No. 37,733

9601 Katy Freeway

Suite 280

Houston, Texas 77024

(713) 881-9600 (phone)

(713) 715-7384 (facsimile)

howard@hspeight.com

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS

Date: January 18, 2008